

throughout the world. U.S. diplomatic installations rely on the ability of the DSS to provide a secure area in which to conduct sensitive functions. These programs provide the secure technical foundation in computer and information security which is so necessary in today's technological age.

The DSS has continually provided crucial support services for our foreign policy and law enforcement objectives. Their contributions have been recognized by the granting of heroism awards by organizations such as the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association (FLEOA) and the International Organization of Chiefs of Police (IACP).

In the first session of Congress, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1998 and 1999 (H.R. 1757), approved the inclusion of members of the DSS under the provisions of the Law Enforcement Availability Pay (LEAP). A separate proposal, H.R. 633, would also include these personnel under the law enforcement retirement provisions. These measures, which provide long overdue parity for DSS personnel with federal law enforcement colleagues, will be important in determining the future role of DSS agents.

I would like to thank the Diplomatic Security Service for the tireless role that they have played in combating terrorism and transnational crime as well as helping to protect U.S. businesses, embassies, and all the branches of the U.S. government represented abroad. They have continually provided crucial services in support of our foreign policy and law enforcement objectives, often at substantial risk to their own lives.●

#### NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS' MEMORIAL DAY

● Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, I rise in recognition of the National Peace Officers' Memorial Day and to pay tribute to the 305 officers of the law who lost their lives in the line of duty during the past year. I want to recognize specifically the six officers in North Carolina who put community safety ahead of their own lives. These six individuals approached the job valiantly. Their courage is inspiring, and their commitment to duty provides the kind of example so desperately needed in today's society.

I would, of course, be remiss if I did not mention the families of the officers I now recognize. I extend my heartfelt gratitude and deepest admiration for those who everyday watch and support their husbands, wives, parents, and children on the front line of crime fighting. Their sacrifice is beyond measure, and we are forever indebted to these brave men and women.

I call to the attention of Congress the names and survivors of North Carolina's six fallen officers and ask that my colleagues join me in saluting these courageous individuals.

Sergeant William Earl Godwin who served with the Morrisville Police De-

partment. Sergeant Godwin's survivors include his wife, Allison, and their daughter, Mercedes.

Detective Paul Andrew Hale who served with the Raleigh Police Department. Detective Hale's survivors include his wife, Connie, and their daughters, Jessica and Stephanie.

Chief of Police Willard Wayne Hathaway who served with the Sharpsburg Police Department. Among Chief Hathaway's survivors is his son, Shaun.

Corporal David Walter Hathcock who served with the Cumberland County Sheriff's Office. Corporal Hathcock's survivors include his wife, Barbara, and his sons, Phillip, Daniel, and Kevin.

Sergeant Lloyd Edward Lowry who served with the North Carolina Highway Patrol. Sergeant Lowry's survivors include his wife, Dixie, his daughters, Lori and Melissa, and his grandchildren, Dustin, Brooke, and Nolan.

Officer Mark Allen Swaney who served with the Davidson Police Department. Officer Swaney is survived by his parents, Larry and Glenda.

Mr. President, every North Carolinian mourns the loss of our six peace officers. I am privileged to convey the State's resounding and unanimous sentiment of appreciation, and our continuing respect for the skills, bravery, and dedication of our law enforcement officers.●

#### 1998 JAMES FORRESTAL MEMORIAL AWARD

● Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, on the evening of May 6th, I had the honor of being in the audience to witness the presentation of the 1998 James Forrestal Memorial Award by the National Defense Industrial Association to the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska, the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee and Chairman of the Defense Subcommittee, Senator TED STEVENS. The first recipient of this impressive award was President Dwight D. Eisenhower, followed by a number of most distinguished citizens who were personally involved in helping our nation during difficult times, and who guided the development of a close working relationship between our government and private industry toward the requirements of National Security.

I have had the privilege of working with Senator STEVENS for nearly 30 years. It is no secret that I admire and deeply respect our colleague. Our nation is truly fortunate to have as Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, an individual as dedicated to public service and to the maintenance of military strength and readiness.

Upon receipt of this award, Senator STEVENS shared with the audience his views on the status of the military and our nation's future. These, perhaps provocative, but, definitely profound remarks should be studied and restudied by all who believe in the importance of our military forces.

Mr. President, I ask that Senator STEVENS' address be printed in the RECORD.

The Address follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TED STEVENS

As one who admired Sec. James Forrestal, it is a great honor to receive this award which bears his name. The name of a great leader who responded with vision and insight to the defense organizational, and leadership, needs of our Nation after World War II.

Indeed, Secretary Forrestal, serving as Secretary of the Navy, demonstrated great courage and wisdom as an advocate for a restructuring of the Department of War and Department of Navy—a restructuring we all know led to today's Department of Defense.

The Forrestal Award is especially meaningful coming from your organization—NDIA. By insuring that industry has a strong, clear voice on defense issues, NDIA serves our Nation well.

Secretary Forrestal's visionary leadership established a national security structure which has seen us through over fifty years of peace and war. With only modest adjustments, the course he charted allowed us to navigate through the cold war.

Some of Secretary Forrestal's observations from 1947 provide a thoughtful perspective on current defense issues.

In testimony on the National Security Act of 1947, Secretary Forrestal said the bill "provides an organization which will allow us to apply the full punitive power of the United States against any future enemy. It provides for the coordination of the three armed services, but what is to me even more important than that, it provides for the integration of foreign policy with national policy, of our civilian economy with military requirements."

Just as our Nation faced a "Post World War" environment in 1947, we now prepare for the 21st century and military contingencies which differ greatly from the cold war. Tonight I will focus on some common themes which motivate us, like Secretary Forrestal, to ponder the need for adjustments in the current defense establishment.

After World War II, the nation had to devise a new military-industrial structure to prepare us for an uncertain future. In 1947 testimony, Secretary Forrestal outlined his thinking—he said:

"First, there is a need, apparent during and since the war, for the planned integration of all of the elements, energies, and forces in our Nation which have to be drawn upon to wage successful war. In these categories come not merely the Army and Navy and the State Department, but industry, and by 'industry' I mean industrial management, which I regard as one of the keystones which produce success in war."

All these concerns are valid today, but the facts underlying the need he discussed will be significantly changed. DOD will be buying in a less competitive environment than ever—requiring careful attention to ensure that innovation and foresight are not lost.

Further, today's defense systems are more complex, take dramatically longer to develop and build, and cost significantly more to acquire, maintain and operate. In the first nine months of 1945, we accepted delivery 5,111 P-51 Fighters. Now, at the peak rate, we will build 36 F-22's and 48 F-18 E/F's, both with long lead times greater than 33 months.

Not only are there fewer prime defense contractors, but each one is moving to be more efficient; inevitably this process will limit or eliminate excess production capacity. The speed and success of Desert Storm demonstrated the new role for industrial management in a "come as you are" war.

I remember visiting Joint Stars in Saudi Arabia—a system in the demonstration/validation phase of development, but being used

in the overall Desert Storm operation—while still under industry control and support.

Indeed, we rarely hear discussion now about raw material shortages or industrial surge capacity. And we are no longer an Island Nation—this Nation's military industrial base is now part of a global economy. This industrial challenge has parallels in our military command structure.

Secretary Forrestal, intimately familiar with the demands of World War II, enunciated what others often think when he said—"Military strength today is not merely military power but its is economic and industrial strength."

Today we continually find ourselves in peacekeeping and other contingency missions—missions for which our soldiers and leaders are not necessarily trained or equipped. Instabilities are more likely to call for a response to terrorism, civil war, and ethnic strife, instead of territorial invasion.

Future battles may take place in urban environments with political constraints on collateral damage, difficult conflict conditions for any military commander. Deploying military force should not be the solution to every regional, ethnic or humanitarian crises. No forces should deploy overseas unless we establish mission objectives that our political and military leadership can plainly articulate.

A second similarity to the challenges faced by James Forrestal is the confidence of the Nation in the weapon systems and combat platforms within the military inventory. Secretary Forrestal concisely outlined his thoughts in words I believe ring true today—"Men fight not for abstractions, but for the concrete things they can visualize in terms of their own country." Following World War II, this Nation felt confident in its ability and the then-existing "Tools of war".

Following operation Desert Storm, the United States was equally confident in our weapons. I saw first hand during the gulf war the impact that "early" generation precision guided weapons and information technologies, such as JSTARS, had on our decisive victory in that conflict.

The entire world saw those advances also—we now need new technologies to assure that our "cutting edge" is sharp. We must implement those technologies rapidly.

Obviously, we also need new tactics, new systems, and a modernized command, control, and communications management concept. And, there are new threats—ballistic missiles, cruise missiles, chemical and biological weapons, information warfare, and space-based sensors and systems.

These resonate Secretary Forrestal's comments on the need for a "planned integration of all of the elements, energies, and forces in our Nation."

These new threats call into question the traditional weapons of war as well as the accepted practice of splitting budget resources among the military services. Just as aircraft technology spawned a new military service, the new technology forces which will influence future warfare demand that we look at our research and development priorities and the allocation of procurement funds.

The last parallel to 1947 I cite is one I deal with most directly as Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee—that is the pressure of a substantially decreased budget. As each of you know, the defense budget today has reached dangerously low levels. Defense spending has fallen far faster than any other category of Federal spending—dropping 39% since 1985. In constant dollars, it is lower than 1939. Yet, the budget agreement, as well as current public sentiment, makes it most likely that defense spending will be flat through 2002.

The pressures on this flat budget are as great as I have ever seen, and probably greater than the pressures faced by our leaders in 1947. One basic fact is that neither Congress nor DOD have much flexibility in the Defense budget.

Force structure determines the level of military personnel spending—presently about one-third of our budget. Second, these forces must be trained and ready which consumes roughly one-third of the Defense budget devoted to operation and maintenance.

Finally, the remaining one-third is left to modernize and develop the next generation of military systems which will ensure no adversary can match U.S. soldiers, sailors, marines and airmen. However, this remaining "one-third" for modernization is not what it used to be.

In constant 1998 dollars, procurement has declined from \$104 billion in FY 1988 to \$49 billion in FY 1998 and R&D declined from \$48 billion to \$36.5 billion. That decline is exacerbated by on-going contingency operations in Bosnia and Iraq.

The \$10.5 billion committed to Bosnia alone from 1995-1999 will consume all the savings achieved by tough base closure and force structure decisions, while also reducing our investment in modernization and R&D. To meet these challenges, we can no longer afford business as usual at DOD.

This brings our discussion back to my first point—future conflicts will stress our current military and defense industrial establishment. These entities will have to work together to consolidate functions, precisely define missions, eliminate redundancy and assure victory through perfection of planning and execution through total use of command, control, communications and intelligence functions.

The challenge before us today is to look towards a new national defense establishment for a new century in a new millennium—a structure which will allow our great Nation to organize, plan, and maintain peace and security.

Secretary Forrestal once said, "The greatest economy is in preventing war. The best insurance against war is national preparedness and an effective coordination of our foreign and our military policy." These are the goals we continue to strive to achieve. I solicit help from each of you in defining new ideas needed to carry this Nation securely into the 21st century.

Knowing I will be working with all of you in the days ahead, I am honored to be recognized by this group with the Forrestal Award.●

#### ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MAY 12, 1998

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, May 12. I further ask that on Tuesday, immediately following the prayer, the routine requests through the morning hour be granted and the Senate then begin a period of morning business until 10 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each with the following exceptions: Senator MIKULSKI for 15 minutes, and Senator LOTT or his designee for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAMS. I further ask that at 10 a.m. Senator D'AMATO be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAMS. I further ask that at 12:10 p.m. the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 1046, the National Science Foundation reauthorization bill under a previous consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAMS. I further ask that the Senate recess following the vote on the National Science Foundation reauthorization bill until 12:15 p.m. to allow the weekly party caucuses to meet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

#### PROGRAM

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, tomorrow morning at 9:30 a.m. the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 10 a.m. Following morning business, Senator D'AMATO will be recognized to offer and debate a bill regarding breast cancer, and it is hoped that a short time agreement can be reached with respect to the D'Amato bill.

At 11 a.m. under a previous order, the Senate will then proceed to the consideration of the conference report to accompany S. 1150, the agricultural research bill. The time until 12:10 p.m. will be divided among several Members for debate on the conference report.

Following that debate, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the National Science Foundation reauthorization bill under a short time agreement. A rollcall vote is expected to occur on passage of that bill at approximately 12:15 p.m. Therefore, all Senators should be aware that the first vote of Tuesday's session will occur at approximately 12:15 p.m.

Also, under a previous order, when the Senate reconvenes at 2:15 p.m. it will resume consideration of the agricultural research conference report. At that time, Senator GRAMM of Texas will be recognized to move to recommit the conference report. There will be 1 hour for debate on the motion equally divided, and at the conclusion or yielding back of time the Senate will proceed to vote on or in relation to the motion. Following that vote, it is hoped that short time agreements can be reached with respect to the agricultural research conference report, any of several high-tech bills or any other legislation or legislative or executive items cleared for action.

And finally, as a reminder to all Members, a cloture vote will occur on Wednesday on the motion to proceed on the missile defense bill.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:36 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, May 12, 1998, at 9:30 a.m.